## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 7-11 are currently being amended.

Claim 15 is requested to be canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-14 and 16-20 are now pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner argues that there is no support for "embodied on a computer-readable medium" in the disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that the disclosure relates to, *inter alia*, computer program products. One of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand that such program products would be implemented on memory devices or other such computer-readable media, which themselves are well known to those of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, the disclosure of computer program products in the original disclosure would clearly be understood by those skilled in the art as disclosing embodiment of such computer program products on computer-readable media.

The Examiner further argues that "computer-readable medium" may include non-statutory medium. Applicant respectfully notes that the M.P.E.P. clearly supports that the phrase "computer-readable medium" falls within statutory subject matter. See e.g., M.P.E.P. § 2106.01.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. While Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's position and maintains the arguments presented in Applicant's amendment filed on October 25, 2007, Applicant has canceled claim 15 to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,213,143 to Watson et al. (hereinafter "Watson"). As to canceled claim 15, the rejection is moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-9, 11-13 and 16-20 for at least the following reasons.

Embodiments of the present invention relate to transmission of messages through intermediary relays. The messages may contain control messages and user messages. In one embodiment, the messages are compressed when received by the intermediary relay. Since the control messages are used to establish and authenticate sessions with the relays, they are decompressed by the relay. While conventional systems either transmitted completely uncompressed messages or required decompression of the entire message, embodiments of the present invention allow decompression of the control message while allowing user messages to pass through without modifications. Independent claims 1, 7, 12 and 16 each recite this aspect of the present invention.

Watson fails to teach or suggest this feature of the present invention. Watson discloses transmission of messages from a first end terminal (UA1) to a second end terminal (UA2) through a security proxy. The entire message is compressed by UA1 for transmission. The security proxy receives and decrypts the message and then decompresses the entire message. See Watson, col. 7, line 61 – col. 8, line 1. The cited portion of Watson (col. 1, lines 40-43) relates to a conventional message formats and their transmission. In this light, the cited portion details that "[m]essage bodies carry information end-to-end between multimedia devices, e.g. session parameters." There is no teaching or suggestion whatsoever in this portion of Watson of the state of the messages, whether compressed or uncompressed. The cited portion merely details that the messages are sent from one end to another. There is no teaching or suggestion of decompressing the control message while allowing user messages to pass through without modification. There is no teaching or suggestion in Watson of decompressing the control message and allowing the user message to pass through without modifications. It is clear from the disclosure of Watson that the entire message, including the user message, is decompressed by the security proxy.

In the "Response to Arguments" section of the Office Action dated January 9, 2008, the Examiner argues that the abstract of Watson discloses encryption applied after the message has traversed the end terminal link. Applicant respectfully notes that the "end terminal link" referred to in the abstract refers to the first end terminal, not the intermediate relay (the Security Proxy). As clearly illustrated in Figure 4, the message transmitted from the first end terminal (UA1) to the Security Proxy is compressed, while the there is no compressed portion indicated in the message being transmitted from the Security Proxy to the second end terminal (UA2). Specifically, the link between the first end terminal and the Security Proxy notes:

> **Compressed data**(
> SIP Message(
>           Message headers, …

while the link between the Security Proxy and the second end terminal includes no indication of any compressed data.

Thus, it is clear from the Abstract, Figures and remainder of the disclosure of Watson that there is no teaching or suggestion of decompressing the control message and allowing the user message to pass through without modifications.

Claims 7 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0075134 to Aalto et al. (hereinafter "Aalto"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 7 has been amended to clarify that the messages are part of a compressed stream of messages received through the input. This feature is not explicitly disclosed in Aalto. Accordingly, Aalto fails to anticipate amended claim 7.

Applicant respectfully notes that the subject matter of Aalto was under an obligation to be assigned to the assignee of the present application at the time of the invention of the present invention. Aalto is currently assigned to the assignee of the present application. The assignment of Aalto is recorded at Reel/Frame 017333/0628.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 7, 12 and 16 are patentable. Claims 2-6 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole. Similarly, claims 8, 9 and 11 depend from allowable claim 7; claim 13 depends from allowable claim 12; and claims 17-20 depend from allowable claim 16. Therefore, claims 8, 9, 11, 13 and 17-20 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Watson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,734 to Nessett et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

-8-

Claim 10 depends directly from allowable claim 7 and is, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when that claim is considered as a whole. Similarly, claim 14 depends directly from allowable claim 12 and is, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when that claim is considered as a whole.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,


Date: April 9, 2008                          By ____/G. Peter Albert, Jr./_____

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP                             G. Peter Albert Jr.
Customer Number: 30542                          Attorney for Applicant
Telephone:    (858) 847-6735                    Registration No. 37,268
Facsimile:    (858) 792-6773